

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated July 10, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner contended that it is not clear, in claim 34, what would happen if the transmission is incorrectly received. The Examiner then rejected claims 1-10, 12-14, 17-19, 23, 25, 28-31, 36-39, and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. (U.S. patent application publication no. 2003/0220075, hereinafter referred to as “Baker”) in view of Trompower (U.S. patent no. 6,132,306) and further in view of Tamaki et al. (U.S. patent application no. 7,139,527, hereinafter referred to as “Tamaki”). The Examiner rejected claims 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Trompower and Tamaki and further in view of Dinkins (U.S. patent no. 5,633,876). The Examiner rejected claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker in view of Trompower and Tamaki and further in view of Argyroudis (U.S. patent no. 5,892,758). The Examiner allowed claims 20-22 and 48 and objected to claim 24 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The rejections and objections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

The applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 20-22 and 48.

The Examiner rejected claims 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner contended that it is not clear, in claim 34, what would happen if the transmission is incorrectly received. Accordingly, the applicants have amended claim 34 to include the feature of not transmitting to the base site any relayed transmissions that are determined to not have been likely correctly received. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §112 rejection of claim 34 and that claim 34 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 2-10, 12-14, 17-19, 28-33, 36-40, 46, and 47 depend upon allowable claim 34, the applicants respectfully request that claims 2-10, 12-14, 17-19, 28-33, 36-40, 46, and 47 also may be passed to allowance.

Further, in order to put the application in condition for allowance, the applicants have incorporated objected to claim 24, and intervening claim 23, into claim 1, have canceled claims 23 and 24, and have similarly amended claim 41. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claims 1 and 41 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 25 depends upon allowable claim 1 and claims 42-45 depend upon allowable claim 41, the applicants respectfully request that claims 25 and 42-45 also may be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter. Furthermore, please charge any additional fees (including any extension of time fees), if any are due, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
Philippe Sartori et al.

By: Steven May

Steven A. May
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,912
Phone No.: 847/576-3635
Fax No.: 847/576-3750